

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 351

August 2, 1995, 12:46 p.m.
Page S-11153 Temp. Record

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Support for U.S. Missile Defense

SUBJECT: National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 . . . S. 1026. Kyl/Inhofe amendment No. 2077.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 94-5

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1026, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, will authorize \$264.7 billion in total budget authority for the Department of Defense, national security programs of the Department of Energy, civil defense, and military construction accounts. This amount is \$7 billion more than requested (\$5.3 billion more for procurement and \$1.7 billion more for research and development), and is \$2.6 billion less than the amount approved in the House-passed bill.

The Kyl/Inhofe amendment, as amended (see vote No. 350), would express the sense of the Senate "that all Americans should be protected from accidental, intentional, or limited ballistic missile attack." The amendment is based on 12 findings, including:

- 5 nations have declared they have nuclear weapons and at least 20 other nations either unofficially have weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them or are attempting to gain those weapons and delivery systems;
- North Korea has a ballistic missile which can reach Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam;
- Several countries recognize that weapons of mass destruction and missiles increase their ability to deter, coerce, or otherwise threaten the United States;
- the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and similar treaties are not sufficient to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction; and
- the end of the Cold War has changed the strategic environment between the United States and Russia.

As amended, it would also express the sense of the Senate "that front-line troops of the United States armed forces should be protected from missile attacks." Additionally, \$35 million of the \$3.403 billion authorized for missile defenses would be used for the Marine Corps' SAM/MEAD front-line theater missile defense program. A portion of that \$35 million would be used for a study to determine whether a Theater Missile Defense system derived from Patriot missile defense technologies could fulfill the SAM/MEADS requirements at a lower estimated lifecycle cost than the estimated cost for the U.S. portion of the SAM/MEADS program (European allies have committed to paying half the costs of the SAM/MEADS program). The Secretary of Defense would

(See other side)

YEAS (94)				NAYS (5)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (53 or 100%)		Democrats (41 or 89%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (5 or 11%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Kennedy		Breaux	DeWine- ²	
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Kerrey		Byrd		
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kerry		Dorgan		
Bond	Kassebaum	Bingaman	Kohl		Ford		
Brown	Kempthorne	Boxer	Lautenberg		Johnston		
Burns	Kyl	Bradley	Leahy				
Campbell	Lott	Bryan	Levin				
Chafee	Lugar	Bumpers	Lieberman				
Coats	Mack	Conrad	Mikulski				
Cochran	McCain	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Cohen	McConnell	Dodd	Moynihan				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Exon	Murray				
Craig	Nickles	Feingold	Nunn				
D'Amato	Packwood	Feinstein	Pell				
Dole	Pressler	Glenn	Pryor				
Domenici	Roth	Graham	Reid				
Faircloth	Santorum	Harkin	Robb			EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other	
Frist	Shelby	Heflin	Rockefeller				
Gorton	Simpson	Hollings	Sarbanes				
Gramm	Smith	Inouye	Simon				
Grams	Snowe		Wellstone				
Grassley	Specter						
Gregg	Stevens						
Hatch	Thomas						
Hatfield	Thompson						
Helms	Thurmond						
	Warner					SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	

submit a report on this study no later than March 1, 1996. No more than \$10 million of the \$35 million authorized could be spent before the submission of the report.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Kyl/Inhofe amendment will lay the groundwork for the debate to follow. The National Missile Defense Act in this bill has created some controversy. Many Senators agree emphatically with the deployment schedule in the bill for a multi-site, anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense system; others agree with the schedule, but have concerns regarding the ABM Treaty; others are opposed to the schedule or even to any deployment ever. In our estimation, most Senators support the principle behind the Missile Defense Act—that Americans should be protected from accidental, intentional, or limited ballistic missile attack. The Kyl/Inhofe amendment has been offered to confirm that estimation. The Act has several important findings, but it is missing the basic explanation of why it is necessary. By gaining a strong vote in favor of this amendment, we can immediately set the focus of this debate on how to protect Americans from limited ballistic missile strikes, instead of whether we should provide that protection.

The amendment would also add several findings that illustrate why many of us believe this issue is of the utmost urgency. Those findings include that at least 25 countries may be developing weapons of mass destruction and the delivery systems for such weapons, that military and defense analysts believe many of the leaders of these countries would not hesitate to use them against the United States, despite the United States' ability to retaliate massively, that arms control regimes are inadequate to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and that the strategic environment has changed between Russia and the United States. Though many Senators and experts are dismissive of the ability of other countries to develop ballistic missiles within the next 10 years, we note that many other defense analysts predict that North Korea, which is extremely unstable, will have a missile that can strike Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska within 3 years to 5 years. Also, the 10-year estimate assumes that a country will develop ballistic missile capabilities on its own. There are other means of acquiring this technology. For example, China has proven more than willing to sell its missile technology to despots like Iraq's Saddam Hussein (who has already proven his willingness to use missiles as a terrorist weapon by launching Scud missiles against Tel Aviv during the Persian Gulf war). Additionally, commercially available missile technology for peaceful uses can easily be converted to military uses. A rocket that can launch a satellite does not need much modification to launch a warhead. Other Senators have legitimately asked if the United States developing defenses against a limited strike would hurt relations with Russia and thus hurt disarmament efforts in that country. The answer is no. The strategic environment has changed. The United States and Russia are no longer implacable enemies; relations are good, and they have a common interest in being able to defend themselves against small countries that may not be able to launch massive attacks, but which may be able to launch a few nuclear missiles. Russia has frequently recognized the legitimacy of developing limited ABM defense systems.

The Kyl/Inhofe amendment, with its findings, makes it absolutely clear that the threat to America from limited ballistic missile attacks is growing, and that the United States and Russia have a common interest in reducing that threat. It also expresses the sense of the Senate that Americans should be defended from limited ballistic missile attacks. By agreeing to this amendment, Senators will be admitting that there is a danger, and they will be going on record as believing that Americans have a right to be defended from that danger. Agreeing to this amendment will appropriately set the terms of this debate. We urge Senators to vote in its favor.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

Americans should of course be protected from ballistic missile attacks, but that does not mean that this amendment is acceptable. Agreeing to this amendment could be seen as giving tacit support to the development of the multi-site, national missile defense system as outlined in this bill. We adamantly oppose that development for several reasons. First, it responds to a nonexistent threat. The Defense Intelligence Agency has told us that it will take at least 10 years for any hostile country to develop ballistic missiles that can reach America. Also, numerous distinguished nuclear scientists have written to us in opposition to this missile system. Those scientists point out several key facts, including that North Korea's missile development program has been very slow to date, that it is very easy to monitor missile development tests, and that it is very easy to trace the source of any ballistic missile that is fired. From these facts they make the point that any leader with a few weapons of mass destruction who wants to attack the United States will be more likely to smuggle them into the country in order to avoid detection and the threat of massive retaliation.

The United States faces many real foreign and domestic threats, but this threat of a ballistic missile attack from a rogue regime is wildly implausible. Building the national missile defense system outlined in this bill, according to the Congressional Budget Office, is going to cost \$40 billion. We could spend that \$40 billion a lot more wisely on needed defense systems, or, more importantly, on meeting pressing social concerns at home. We would much rather spend this \$40 billion on welfare, the elderly, national health care programs, or education. Agreeing to the Kyl/Inhofe amendment would imply that we in some way support the building of a national missile defense system. We emphatically do not, and must therefore vote in opposition to this amendment.